

**Appl. No. 10/645,140**  
**Amdt. dated July 15, 2005**  
**Reply to Office action of April 18, 2005**

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicants have received the Office action dated April 18, 2005, in which the Examiner: 1) rejected claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Clausen (U.S. Pat. No. 6,039,190); 2) rejected claims 1 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Smith (U.S. Pat. No. 6,654,239); 3) rejected claims 1, 5-7, 9-10, 15-16 and 18-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Mueller et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,804,877); 4) rejected claims 13-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Jahne et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,535,381); 5) rejected claims 15, 17 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clausen in view of Hunt (U.S. Pat. No. 6,332,546); and 6) objected to claims 11-12 as being, "dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten."

With this Response, Applicants have amended claims 1, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, and 15 and canceled claims 5 and 10.

Claim 1 has been amended to require that the claimed computer rack system include at least one removable tray in said drawer and a lid for preventing access to data storage devices stored in said tray. As noted by the Examiner, none of the references teaches or suggests a computer rack system that includes a data storage drawer with a removable tray having a locking lid.

Applicants respectfully submit that the art also does not teach or suggests a computer rack system that includes a data storage drawer with a removable tray having a lid that prevents access to data storage devices stored in the tray. The sole "lid" cited by the Examiner is actually merely the top surface of media storage device 106. By incorporated teachings, media storage device 106 may be a media holding device that includes a housing having at least one media holding detent. Thus, media storage device 106 does not include a lid that prevents access to the data storage devices in the magazine, as required by amended claim 1. The other references also do not teach or suggest a lid that prevents access to the data storage devices in the tray. For this reason, claim 1 and the claims that depend from it are patentable over the art of record.

**Appl. No. 10/645,140**  
**Amdt. dated July 15, 2005**  
**Reply to Office action of April 18, 2005**

Claims 11 and 12 have been amended to incorporate the limitations of the claims from which they formerly depended and are therefore allowable. Claim 11 as originally filed depended from claim 8 but should have depended from claim 10, as illustrated by the lack of antecedent for "said lid." Applicants presume that the Examiner recognized that this fact and did not intend for claim 11 to incorporate the limitations of claims 8, 7 and 5. Applicants have therefore amended claim 11 to incorporate the limitations of claims 10 and 1. The Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned if this is in error.

Claims 13 and 15 have each been amended to recite that at least one of the data storage devices includes a memory chip. Because none of the cited references teaches either a computer system or a method for storing magnetic tapes for use in a computer system that is supported in a frame meeting all of the limitations of claims 13 and 15, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are also allowable.

In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicants may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and the cited art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including

**Appl. No. 10/645,140**  
**Amdt. dated July 15, 2005**  
**Reply to Office action of April 18, 2005**

fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,



Marcella D. Watkins  
PTO Reg. No. 36,962  
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.  
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)  
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
Legal Dept., M/S 35  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400